

---

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUSTAINING CLEAR

---

*CLEAR is a precursor to “community-based government” that the LAPD and other law enforcement agencies are moving toward.*

- Commander Dan Koenig, LAPD, CLEAR Executive Committee

Recommendations for sustaining CLEAR of course overlap with the identification of critical elements for replicating the program (section V). On the other hand, there are a number of recommendations that are more specific to the current CLEAR program, and that address directly what needs to happen if CLEAR is to be sustained beyond its current funding period. In other words, how can CLEAR, or something CLEAR-like, be maintained with a substantial or complete reduction in funding.

Because sustaining CLEAR, at least in the short run, is easily accomplished with continued funding (and effective leadership, management and operations), the issue for this discussion is how the CLEAR, or CLEAR-like, program can be sustained when current levels of outside funding are not sustained. As with the identification of critical elements for replication, recommendations for sustaining CLEAR can be grouped usefully into those that have to do with operations, policy and executive matters, and with fiscal issues.

### A. Operational

1. Identify and secure for an extended period of time adequate facilities to provide for co-location of staff from participating agencies.
2. Identify a community sponsor – e.g., a community-based agency or government office – for the Community Impact Team. This will likely change the composition and even priorities of the Team, but can still keep it engaged in community safety and quality of life activities.
3. More fully utilize available technology – personal computer data bases, cell phones, the Internet, CalGang – to communicate and coordinate activities across departments.

## **B. Policy and Executive**

1. Engage department heads and senior executives in setting departmental policy that further encourages basic CLEAR elements such as geographic targeting, community law-enforcement, vertical prosecution, cross-designation and inter-departmental activities and information-sharing.
2. Develop non-monetary incentives – e.g., opportunities to learn new skills and professional recognition – for law enforcement collaboration. Also recruit Operations Team members who especially strongly value this kind of collaborative work.
3. Expand the collaborative to additional law enforcement agencies (e.g., Parole) and to human services agencies that can partner gang prevention and intervention programs with gang suppression.
4. Leverage new resources by interrelating CLEAR goals with those of other government and foundation initiatives and philosophies such as Healthy Schools, Community-Building Initiatives and Community Governance.
5. Be prepared to change emphases (e.g., toward community engagement and prevention) and defend core commitments (e.g., anti-gang violence) in order to take advantage of new resources.

## **C. Fiscal**

1. Concentrate available fiscal resources first on program coordination, providing necessary infrastructure for executive and operational levels.
2. Identify the optimal funding level that can leverage each core agency's participation without fully reimbursing its costs to be involved in the program.
3. Find outside resources for technical assistance and evaluation.

## **The Cost of Sustaining**

From one phase to the next, the cost of sustaining CLEAR has actually been the cost of considerably *expanding* the program. The number of sites has gone from one to three to six (with one site, Pacific, having two target areas), a much-needed administrative unit has been created, and complementary services have also been expanded. The annual cost of sustaining CLEAR *at its current level of operation* may be as much as a million dollars a month.

A more reasonable question might be: what is the minimum amount needed to sustain and preserve CLEAR's most basic but essential operational (law enforcement and community engagement) functions? The answer turns on a number of factors, including: 1) the extent to which departmental policy, without additional funding, can free and assign resources to CLEAR-type functions; 2) the extent to which "community governance" mechanisms – local neighborhood councils, Council offices, public works, etc. – can effectively assume CLEAR-like community engagement functions, including CLEAR's version of community policing; and 3) the extent to which other appropriate program partners, including law enforcement, public services and nonprofit agencies, can be further incorporated into the CLEAR model with their own contribution of personnel for operations and infrastructure, information, facilities and other resources.

A minimally sustained CLEAR program still needs supportive policies, community engagement and partners. It also requires the "glue" of paid, independent, central administration and sufficient funding to leverage substantial commitment from core departments that may themselves be resource-short. It is important to keep in mind that a program that is minimally funded for its core purposes is always in danger of being overwhelmed by new partners and funding streams, which bring new ideas, some of which are supportive of traditional tenants, and some surely subversive.<sup>1</sup> With substantial in-kind support from core departments, the experience with CLEAR to-date would suggest that the essential elements of CLEAR might be sustained for as little as \$.5 million per site per year, or less if in-kind support, and attachments to other partners, can ensure core program.

---

<sup>1</sup> A "subversive" element would be requirements for full community disclosure of operations or a concentration on certain sub-groups or crimes (e.g., drug using teens).

